School of Theology at Claremont
10011448251

BX
8349
P43
S55
1927

A Methodist Answers the Methodists

COMPLIMENT OF

J. C. DALLENBACH

Printed by

The Americanism Commission
The American Legion
Department of Illinois

— 1 9 2 7 —

By courtesy of
National So-journers Club

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
Calif.

D
8349
.P43
S55
1927

THE AMERICAN LEGION
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

STATE HEADQUARTERS
BLOOMINGTON ILLINOIS

FERRE C. WATKINS — Chicago
Commander

IVAN A. ELLIOTT — Carmi
Senior Vice-Commander

FLOYD J. HECKEL — Bloomington
Adjutant

FRED E. BUSBEY — Chicago
Director Americanism Commission

Rev. NICHOLAS B. CLINCH — Chicago
Chaplain

TOM IRELAND — Washburn
Nat'l Executive Committeeman

ALLAN T. GILBERT — Chicago
Judge Advocate

LESTER R. BENSTON — Chicago
Service Officer

DR. R. O. HAWTHORNE — Monticello
Medical Officer

VICE-COMMANDERS

WM. M. ANDERSON — Kewanee
JOE DELL'ERA — Herrin
BEN F. KREIDER — Sterling
HENRY C. MATHEIN — Lincoln
L. E. McGANN, JR — Chicago

W. C. MUNDT — Bloomington
Organization Officer—Historian

FRED H. YOUNG — Bloomington
Athletic Officer

HENRY G. RHODE — Lake Forest
Sergeant-At-Arms

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: .To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order, to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our association in the Great War, to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, state and nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.—Preamble to the Constitution of The American Legion.

THE AMERICAN LEGION
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS
AMERICANISM COMMISSON
— 1 9 2 7 —

FERRE C. WATKINS — Chicago
Commander

FLOYD J. HECKEL — Bloomington
Adjutant

ALLAN T. GILBERT — Chicago
Judge Advocate

FRED E. BUSBEY — Chicago
Director
914 S. Hoyne Ave.

MEMBERS

J. HOWARD RUSSELL — Clinton
HUGH GREEN — Jacksonville
EDWARD P. SKUBIC — Chicago
2727 S. Tripp Ave.
DON CLARK — Flora

(FOURTH EDITION)

A METHODIST ANSWERS THE METHODISTS

By Lt. Col. LeRoy F. Smith,
of Los Angeles Chapter No. 26

This is an article inspired by the action of the North-East Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; its formal withdrawal of its sanction and support of any war in which the United States might be engaged. The article contains:

1. A copy of the Conference Resolution.
2. A letter sent by Colonel Smith to a minister friend in the Conference, inquiring how the Conference happened to pass such a resolution.
3. The strangely specious and palpably pink-patch-work reply of the minister.
4. The categorical answer by Colonel Smith of the minister's sophistries.

EDITOR'S NOTE.

The article and letters which follow will be read with more than passing interest by all Sojourners and lovers of our Country. Col. Smith in his letters has submitted facts which may be used by all real Americans in answering those who oppose the National Defense Act. The Sojourners Constitution provides "to oppose any influence whatsoever calculated to weaken the national security."

Col. Smith was born June 1, 1883, in the Methodist Episcopal parsonage in New Washington, Crawford County, Ohio, the son of Rev. E. L. Smith of the Northeast Ohio (old North Ohio) Methodist Conference, and the grandson of the late Rev. John Whitworth of the same conference. He graduated from the Smithville, Ohio High School and the Savannah, Ohio, Academy. Had his first military training in the Methodist Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and while in school there enlisted as a private in the Fourth Ohio Infantry. (His company has the distinction of having had as one of its cooks in the Spanish-American War a Methodist minister, who sought that humble post in order to do his patriotic bit in the liberation of Cuba.)

Col. Smith graduated from the First Officers Training Camp at Ft. Benjamin Harrison as a Captain of Infantry. Four months later promoted to Major. His previous hospital experience as owner of the Lodi General Hospital, Lodi, Ohio, caught up with him in the Army and much against his desires he was held at

Camp Sherman and put in charge of the Development, Remedial and Educational work. During the "Flu" epidemic, he organized and conducted an 80-bed auxiliary hospital in his battalion, and due to the rigid and prompt measures introduced by him, the flu mortality in his battalion was kept to the lowest ratio in the cantonment. Later he assumed charge of Occupational Therapy activities. In addition to his other duties he was Editior-in-Chief of the Camp Sherman News and ran this paper with marked financial success.

Since 1920, except for a few months in the regular army in Camp Travis, Texas, (9th Infty.) Col. Smith has made Los Angeles his home, and in addition to his business, doing patriotic and church work. He has been "Commander-in-Chief of the great Red, White and Blue Men's Bible Class of the First Episcopal Church of Los Angeles since 1924.

He is a graduate of the Army Command and General Staff School at Ft. Leavenworth and has had a tour of active duty on the War Department General Staff, as a Reserve Officer, where he had supervision of the Army Correspondence Schools.

Additional copies of this article may be obtained upon request.

INTRODUCTION

On Christmas Day, 1925, I visted my father, a retired Methodist Episcopal minister in northern Ohio. While sitting in his study, I chanced to pick up his copy of the minutes of the conference of 1925; and from these minutes I received the astonishing intelligence of the Conference's unconditional withdrawal of its support and sanction of any future war in which our country might become involved.

My father is nearly blind; he had not read the report of this action. And although he was in attendance upon the conference in question, he was not present at the eleventh hour session when the resolution was proposed and "by a small majority" adopted. The knowledge of the church's action was news to him as it was news to me. I am proud to say it was as distressing to him as it was to his son.

A somewhat strange situation may be noted here. If this conference had been preparing to launch a great pronouncement for World Evangelism; if it had staged a great church development project whose final drive was to culminate on the afternoon of the seventh and last day of its session, I am very certain

that my father would have got wind of it. This other matter, although it marked a complete reversal of a church policy as old as the church itself, and a policy which could not help but affect the principles of thousands of the church's constituents, was groomed for presentation with a singular absence of publicity, and was presented on the last day of the conference very close to the time when the people always start putting on their wraps.

The question raised by this action of the conference in which I was born and raised and lived until I removed to the Southern California conference (my present church home and actual residence) is in my case infinitely more than a mere academic question.

In 1917, I went to the army with the blessing and God speed of the Methodist Church, just as my relatives had done in every emergency from the War of 1812 to the Spanish American War.

When I returned from the active service, I joined the Reserve Corps of the United States Army. If the country needed me again, I proposed to be not only at her call, but to be more fit to answer her call than I was the first time. I had learned too much about the needless slaughter of untrained troops to come back and sit idly down and see it happen again. If I were to be called on by the citizens to lead Methodist boys and Presbyterian boys and Catholic boys and assorted American boys into another defense, I wanted to know something about my job.

And so I came back to my civilian vocation, back to the Reserve, and back to the work of the church. And the Methodist Church welcomed me back and hung my blue star in its flag over its altar, and set me to work, a veteran member accorded honor in the church immeasurably out of proportion to my very humble military service.

The church even made use of my military training, and some years ago it put me at the head of a great men's Bible Class in Los Angeles, where military organization and methods were utilized to increase the interest in the study of God's Word. The pen with which I write is a gift from that Methodist Class.

My interest in the Methodist Church, my zeal for her ideals, is bred in my bones. The Sunday after Christmas found me leading the massed adult Bible Classes of my father's Methodist Church in his Ohio town.

What, then, is to be my reaction to the pronouncement of my conference, with-

drawing its sanction of my participation in any war "even a war of defense" (too presumptuous, this, in its implication that America has any thoughts of military conquest)?

Like every other able-bodied male citizen of America, Methodist or what not, between 18 and 45, I am a member of the unorganized militia of the nation. No ceremony is necessary for that, if one be a native; we are born into that obligation.

And my church now says one thing, and my country, under whose protection my church has grown powerful and mighty for service, says another.

My country has not changed her position. My church has changed her position, and in the manner of that change, she seeks to assult my country's basic law, not by the orderly, legal processes provided by legislation, but by the illegal withdrawal of her sanction and support of the national constitution and the statutes thereunder.

I carefully studied the resolution of the conference. I then wrote the first letter appearing herewith, to a minister of the conference whose name appeared among the sponsors of the measure. He replied, and his letter follows mine. And his letter was so full of the sorry sophistries which pass for argument in this new school of thought, that I replied to him at length, painstakingly and accurately, not, as I told him frankly, with any purpose to engage in an argument, but in order that I might get at the root of a matter which affects me more closely than any other question can.

My reply to him for the present must conclude this article; for he has not answered it.

Resolution of the Methodist Conference.

Extract from the Official Record and Year Book of the Fourteenth Annual Session of the Northeast Ohio Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, 1925, held in the Main Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Akron, Ohio, September 22 to 28, 1925.

Seventh Day—Afternoon Session.

Akron, Ohio

Monday, Sept. 28, 1925.

Members on Commission on Boundaries, —, —, —, —, —, and — — — — — — — — presented a resolution relative to the attitude of the Church toward war, as follows:

Whereas, By the united judgement of Christian leaders everywhere, war today is recognized as our most colossal and far-reaching social sin;

Whereas, Our own Methodist Episcopal Church has declared, through its General Conference, that war "is the supreme enemy of mankind."

Therefore, Be it resolved by the North-East Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as a part of the Church Universal, the Body of Christ in the world, should in its corporate capacity refuse to sanction or support any future war, and

Be it Further Resolved, that, recognizing the great protestant principle of individual judgement in matters of personal conduct, we do not presume to pass judgment upon the right of any individual in the event of war, to follow his own enlightened conscience, whether that takes him into the forces of armed defense or into the ranks of conscientious objectors.

(Then follow the names of thirty-six ministers who sponsored the resolution.)

It was adopted by a small majority.

Colonel Smith's Letter to the Minister

January, 1926.

Rev. ——

——

My dear Brother ——— :

On my recent visit to my father, Rev. E. L. Smith, at Manfield, Ohio, I had my first glimpse of the minutes of the 1925 session of the North-East Ohio Conference, at Akron.

This was the first knowledge, then, that I had had of a matter which came up on the seventh day of that conference, which seems to be so widely at variance with my thought upon the subject, that I can with difficulty credit my eyes. I refer to the resolution against Methodist participation in any war, which was signed by yourself, and thirty-five other members, introduced by —— and passed by a "small majority."

I feel that you and I are close enough, in personal acquaintance, in fraternal ties, in our common ideals, in our similar sonships in the ministry, and in our love for our Christ and His church, so that I may discuss with you as I could with but few others, the sentiment and policy of this resolution. You, I am persuaded, will accord my remarks the careful and prayerful consideration which I should give to yours in a similar case.

I have endeavored with considerable study and care, to analyze and to put the most liberal interpretation possible upon the resolution referred to. At the end, however, I find myself unable to subscribe to its doctrine. That puts me in

an anomalous position, as a man who has been a Methodist for more than one hundred years, personally or hereditarily. I have ever sought to follow the banner of my church with the same single devotion with which my forebears and I have always followed the flag of my country. Indeed, it has always been a potent source of joy to find, in the past, that both flags led us in the same direction.

Will you bear with me while I analyze the conference resolution?

It begins by saying that, "By the judgment of Christian leaders everywhere, war is recognized as our most colossal social sin." Without desiring for an instant to minimize the horrors of war, or the baleful effects of war upon society, may I nevertheless point out that most sociologists are agreed in considering war to be but a symptom of disease, and not a primary of disease itself? Let us suppose, for example, that an inordinately selfish and short-visioned nation were to impose a ruinously prohibitive tariff upon the principal source-of-incomes product of a neighboring state. Let us suppose further, that the sole market for this product is among the people of the tariff-imposing nation.

To the nation thus deprived of its principal means of support, excessive high tariff is "the most colossal social sin." in the hypothetical case, this sin will breed a horrid crew of ancillary evils—poverty, ignorance, smuggling, bribery, hatred—and as soon as may be, war.

Note that I said, "as soon as may be." By that I mean, that, even though the oppressed nation be quite unarmed, quite unprepared for strife, utterly pacific and pacifistic, when the imposition is first made, it will steadily bend its energies toward the time when it may by the display of force remedy the prime social and economic evil which has produced all these horrid symptoms.

War, in this instance, like war in all instances, is but the overt gesture of a national sentiment. If war were not an available argument, at first, then the arguments of the boycott and of social and political ostracism would be employed, as a starter and until the remedy of war was thought to be sufficiently available.

If the oppressed nation found itself in the beginning without a single gun, ship, or aeroplane, it would but delay the overt, technical declaration of war. It would not avert the spirit of war in the hearts of the people.

The next statement in the conference

resolution is that "war is the supreme enemy of mankind." In respect of that statement, may I, for the first part, refer to my presentment above; and for the second part, may I ask whether, if you or I were black Americans instead of white Americans, we should subscribe to the statement that the Civil War is the worst enemy of our mankind? Or, if you and I were two of the many thousands of Porto Rican high school graduates since 1898, would we say that the Spanish-American War was the worst enemy of our mankind?

Or, barring these two hypotheses, can we very logically or very gratefully say that the actions of our forebears, captained by George Washington on his knees before God at Valley Forge, were the worst enemy of our mankind? Are we not forgetting that there would not have been a President Washington if there had not been a General Washington?

The Conference resolution then makes this pronouncement: "Be it resolved by the North-East Ohio Conference that the Methodist Episcopal Church * * * should in its corporate capacity refuse to sanction or to support any future war."

Many thousands of our citizenry today, including many devout Methodists, are by our sanction and support, engaged in constant armed warfare against murderers, vandals, thugs and burglars. These latter are in many instances organized and directed with a military strategy of the ablest sort. Not content with the passive, defensive barricades of our front door locks and keys, we hire and place in batttle array in front of our wives, children, and property, more armed guards than we ever have in our peacetime militaray forces. This warfare yearly takes its toll of thousands of lives, and of a billion dollars of our property.

Now, you and I believe that the practice of the principles of the religion of Jesus Christ in the lives of these malefactors in America would render unnecessary this armament against them. Further, you and I are working with what skill we may, under God, to sow the seeds of this Christian doctrine so deep and so wide that all men may follow Him, to their own peace and to the safety of civilization.

Should we not logically, then, disarm and discharge our organized police and constabulary, more numerous than our army, and by so doing, set to the nations an example of our faith? Or are we

wise in following the example of Nehemiah, building our temple of Christianity with the trowel of doctrine and precept in one hand, and the sword of self protection in the other?

Now, the Conference refuses to "sanction or to support" any war. May I point out, then, that it is most illogical in detailing two of its ministers to represent it in the Army of the United States? Does it not know, that in case of war, and in case of the death of the commanding officer, and of the executive officer, and of the adjutant, these two chaplains would actually lead their battalions in the battle? But quite apart from that contingency, and quite apart from your withdrawal of your sanction from Chaplain McCabe and a hundred others in every conflict—the Conference is giving its sanction and support, to every war into which America might order her troops, by your detail of these ministers to be officers in the army.

The last statement in the Conference resolution is the most illogical of all. It says, in substance, "Recognizing * * * individual judgment, we do not presume to pass judgment upon the right of the individual in the event of war to follow his own conscience, whether it takes him into the forces of armed defense or into the ranks of conscientious objectors."

Now, we see, in this, several implications. For example, we see that the stricture placed by this resolution is upon defensive warfare, no less than upon any hypothetical war of agression or attack upon another nation. In short, the sanction and support of our church is withdrawn from any and all defense in any heinous attack whatsoever upon our wives and our children, by an invading foe. Divine principles are the same today, yesterday, and forever; and therefore, our conference casts its official frown upon every Methodist in Belgium who stood between the German foe and his loved ones, with sword drawn for the defense of his home. The North-East Ohio Conference casts its official frown upon the Methodists of Columbus, New Mexico, who hastened to train their rifles upon the slaughterers of their neighbors. And the North-East Ohio Conference casts its official frown upon any group of Methodists who in a similar future case, may answer a similar call.

Another implication is found here: the Conference implies, by the whole text and tenor of the resolution, that the conscientious objector, in this defensive

war, will be more nearly following the ideal of the church, than will he who elects to defend. In other words, the church's blessing will be upon the conscientious objector; the defender may go in to defend, but without the church's blessing, sanction, or support.

Lastly this conclusion, as might be expected from its very nature, is lacking in moral courage. Do we allow individual liberty of thought and practice in the matter of polygamy? Do we permit individual conscience to guide our membership in the matter of selling intoxicating liquors, gambling, profanity, or social vice?

Well, if war be our greatest social sin, why do we hedge? This presentment is fitting and proper only in that it comports with nice exactness, with our whole position—that of a withholding, in toto, our sanction of Methodist participation in national defense.

As conscientious objectors, the Conference seems to have gone the whole way—to a conscientious objection to preventing its membership from engaging in "the world's greatest evil."

A letter to a Bible student like yourself is not the proper occasion to animadvert to the employment by the Master of one of the weapons of the infantry of his day—the scourge. For like reasons it is perhaps unnecessary to recall that at least one of Christ's three executives carried a sword throughout his ministry upon the Lord, even to Gethsemane. It might be timely to remind you that on the occasion when Peter used the sword, Christ, with his knowledge of the futility of a resort to arms upon that occasion, told his executive not to throw his sword away, but to put it up in its sheath.

And if we are to argue that Nehemiah, arming his followers with swords in one hand, while they plied the trowel in the other, to build the house of the Lord, belonging to the old and not the new, dispensation—then we may ask why his zeal is commended in the New Testament.

From the "Life of Chaplain McCabe," I quote from the funeral oration of Dr. Wm. V. Kelly, Editor of the Methodist Review, over the bier of our most beloved Bishop, the Field Marshal of Methodism, "It is simply unthinkable thats, a man with the ideals and hopes he had in his heart, should have stayed at home an refrained from answering the call for the defense of freedom and the Union." What were Chaplain McCabe's ideals?

And Chaplain McCabe himself, in his talk to the old soldiers: "God bless you, old soldiers! You are the men who saved your country! God bless you! And when Death beats his low tattoo for you, you will hear God's voice saying, "Well done, old soldier, come unto Me and rest; and may I be there to greet you!"

Was Kelly mouthing cheap sophistry? Was McCabe using the name of the God he loved and knew so well, to make a grandstand play? Was it any war that McCabe and thousands of Methodists sanctioned by their heroism? Would you vote to withdraw your sanction of McCabe, or these others?

In the Spring of 1917, the Methodist who writes this, heard the call of Belgium, and read the plan to invade his own country through Mexico. (You doubt that last, believing those who falsely discredit it? I'll show you the papers here, any time.) Other Methodists, by thousands, heard that call. And we answered. And because of our unpreparedness, our love for peace which was so blind as to keep us untrained, we lost more men than twice the population of your town, killed by lack of training.

But those men who went out, went out in compliance with the Constitution of the United States, and of all laws under that Constitution, when they provide that you and I and all men between the ages of 18 and 45, have, as one of the obligations of citizenship, the obligation to bear arms in our nation's support. That law is in the basic law of our country; it stands alongside the Prohibition Amendment.

The North-East Ohio Conference by its vote, has put itself in array against the basic law of the land, alongside of the bootlegger. One seeks to evade, nullify, and break down the 18th Amendment; the other seeks to evade, nullify, subvert and cripple the original document.

There is sometimes attempted, of late, a defense of the weak sophistry that our modest plan for preparedness engenders war. Hear me; we have been dragged into a war each generation of our national life—and we have never been prepared! Not a graveyard in America but holds its shaft to a soldier murdered needlessly by our policy in the past.

And now what do we seek? Nothing but a sane, economical national defense plan which will make us sure as may be, that if, the last expedient having failed, we be called upon to defend, it be not necessary as it has always been in the

past, to add wanton murder to the miseries of conflict.

I said "economical." I mean that; for this last year, the fifth under the National Defense Act of June, 1920, our army appronortion cost you just $2.55 Our national chewing gum bill was three times that. You say, "Yes, but what about all the expense we carry on account of past wars?" Truly, that is great; and the reason it is great is that we were unprepared on those occasions. Shall we say, that on account of our former great losses by past fires, we shall cut down on our insurance against future fires?

You say, "But we'll avoid future fires." May I point out to you twenty-one major conflagrations which have broken out since the time, less than a decade ago, when we went over to put out the fire which was to be the last?

If I have wandered a bit, I have not wandered farther than the North-East Ohio Conference will wander if it follows its vote to its logical conclusion.

Methodism has enjoyed, in a peculiar measure, the confidence of this nation and of its rulers. The nation, in its righteous, disinterested battling for humanity, has in all its wars given voice to its thanks for the support of this great church. Her ministers and laymen have been conspicuous in the councils and in the ranks. The Methodist Church, like the land in which she has flourished, has been permitted under God to wax strong when battling for righteousness.

Now, were the need to arise once more, are we to see Methodism shelter herself behind the Presbyterians, and Catholics, and Baptists, and Episcopalians, and later enjoy with shameless face, the fruits of their sacrifices?

Do we hear the specious prating about "Militarism?" There is no such thing in America; there has never been; there will never be. Militarism is the wielding of military influence, by a military group, for military (as opposed to purely national) purposes; and our National Defense Act, and all workings thereunder, are the product of the civilian group as opposed to the professional military group, of our citizenry. Less than 10 per cent of the officers of the United States Army today have the profession of arms as their regular vocation—they are civilians, your peace loving neighbors. Look at your icemen, your mechanic, your bookkeeper, your merchant, your lawyer, your baker; are they militaristic? They are your army today.

There are fewer of our college boys doing "squads right" today, in proportion to our population, than there were doing squads right twenty-five years ago. Why did not the Conference make its pronouncement twenty-five years ago? Have fundamentals changed? Or was it afraid of McCabe?

I might, my friend, suggest that we alter that blessed old hymn to read—

"Onward Christian slackers,
Marching to the rear."

but that would not be kindly. More than that, I don't believe, nor do you believe, that in any defense of humanity, your church and mine would sing it that way.

But—the moment I am persuaded that the sentiment of the Methodist Church is voiced in the North-East Ohio Conference resolution, that moment will I say, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord of McCabe."

LeRoy F. Smith,
Lt. Colonel, Reserve,
United States Army.

1539 Eye Street, N. W.
Apartment 7,
Washington, D. C.

The Minister's Reply

Lieut. Colonel LeRoy F. Smith,
Washington, D. C.

My dear old friend:

Mighty glad to hear from you. I shall always count upon you as my friend.

I seldom answer letters of protest to my views. I answer you for old times sake.

It was with mingled astonishment and amazement that I read your protest to the action taken by the greatest Conference in Methodism. The action was fostered by the leading men in the Conference. The writer of the document, pastor of our — Church, was an overseas man and is thoroughly patriotic. Only two men took exception to the action, and they are small minded men in the small churches of the Conference. Their opposition has no weight at all in the debate.

Of course I can readily see that your arguments (which are the common stock of arguments used by all militarists, with which I am familiar) are colored by your relations to the national guard. I would naturally expect it. Plainly, the further I read into your letter the more certain I was that our action was right and very timely.

Seventy years ago it was thought

right to drink alcoholic drinks and sell it. The time came when Christian people, and the Methodists took the lead, took action aand said "the saloon must go." Those who take the position that the 18th Amendment is wrong and unseasonal argue as you do for war. They condemn Christian people for interfering with their rights.

At the very time of slavery Southern Christians thought slavery right. We of the North felt it was wrong. Slavery had to go in the interest of progress. My father was in the Civil War. I belong to the Sons of Veterans organization. Most historians think that the slave business could have been settled in a more humane way than by the awful havoc of war. We have not recovered from its ill effects. England freed her slaves without war. We Americans should be as wise as the English.

War has never settled anything. After the smoke has cleared away, men must get together around a table and come to terms. Why not come to terms without the debacle of fighting? The black man is still a problem unsettled by wars that freed him. I have heard many an old soldier in blue say he would not fight to free the Negro had he the chance to do it over again.

This last World War, as you know from the facts at hand, was largely misrepresented and fostered by propaganda. Those horrid stories of Belgium atrocities were sheer speeches of English and Canadian officers who have on many occasions confessed the same in mirth.

The present wave of crime and the moral slump into which we have been thrown is attributable to the last war. War is hell.

This war was a victory for the wrong people. The war was won politically by France, financially by America, and religiously by the Roman Catholics. The best historians now say that every nation violated treaties! that England planned to cross Belgium but Germany beat her to it.

When you say we have never been prepared you placed an awful blot upon the military forces in our country. Eighty-seven per cent of our federal income goes out every year for war purposes—according to the statement of President Coolidge. If it took 87 per cent of the business of the Standard Oil or the United States Steel Company to police their interests we would feel there is something wrong in administration. The danger of America following in the foot-

steps of Germany is growing at an alarming rate. The attempt is being made to militarize colleges and high schools. No wonder educators, students and citizens are protesting against Germanizing our American schools. We are doing what we condemned Germany for.

Remember, every nation that has perpetuated itself by the sword has perished by the sword. David was not allowed to build the beautiful temple the Lord had planned because he was a man of war and not of peace.

There have been three historical plagues that have wrecked every nation thus far; famine, pestilence and war. We have conquered famine through agriculture and commerce. We have conquered pestilence by the science of medicine and sanitation. The last historic plague to be conquered is war. It is still with us to blight and damn. At Washington do we have a Secretary of Disease and a Secretary of Famine? Of course not. And yet we have two Secretaries of War: A Secretary of the Army, and a Secretary of the Navy . We have a Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of the Interior, a Secretary of Commerce, etc. Why not have a Secretary of Peace?

The hand of God has never been on the side of the best equipped army, but always on the side of the right. If a nation is right it can never be destroyed. Right, not might, has always won. You will remember what President Lincoln said—he was Commander-in-Chief of the military forces—he said he did not pray that God would be on his side in the conflict, but that he wanted to be sure he was on the side of God (right).

The present actions being taken by outstanding men and churches concerning war grew out of the criticism of the Church during the World War. The Church was blamed because it did not prevent this war. Instead it sanctioned war. Men in our pulpits damned the Kaiser and turned the people from love to hate. We are paying a pretty price for it today. What did the war do? Only to deepen the hatred between the nations.

Take away the profits of the war and we will have no more wars. Put every business man, every manufacturer, every citizen at home or in army or navy on a dollar a day and there will be no more war. Compel the men who make or declare war to go to the front and do the real fighting and there will be no more wars.

I was a four-minute speaker, a member of the draft board, and a member

of the physician's staff in the late war. The men who went "over there" think one had been put over on them. I have heard the noblest ex-service men say again and again "never again. The next war will be an officer's war!"

We have to use locks to prevent stealing. But "policing" and "war" are two very different things. Policing is to protect. War is planned in cold blood to destroy.

Every person who has taken the lead in any reform has been misunderstood, maligned, and opposed. But a new day has come. The men in this movement are the ablest ministers in America, the most heroic citizens, the most willing to defend the honor of country under all circumstances.

Please remember that the Methodists have always been leaders in every reform. The Methodist Church split wide open over slavery. We still have the Methodist Church South who are still sore about the Civil War. We Methodists lead in the temperance reform. Of course we Methodists are leading in this greatest and most glorious reform of all—preparing the way to eliminate war as a pagan method of settling international difficulties. I do not condemn my forefathers who fought in the Revolutionary War, and my father who was in the Civil War. I would gladly have done the same thing. This World War has demanded a new attitude toward war in general. Whenever we say a thing is wrong its days are numbered. When we say and see that war is wrong, war is doomed. I would like to see the day when we will learn war no more. As long as we prepare for war we will have wars. Instead of spending 87 per cent of our good American money for bloodshed and only 2 per cent for education, if we would reverse the expenditure and spend a generous amount for international good-will, world courts, and fellowship, we will be able to do without wars. When we call war by its right name, "murder," and recognize that a nation can commit murder as well as any individual and deserves punishment for it, wars will have to cease.

There was a time when we thought it necessary to carry pistols in self defense to settle disputes. We have outlawed duelling to our benefit. Two things we are going to do: outlaw war and excommunicate war.

We have the fighting instinct. We must turn that instinct into nobler channels and uses. We must learn to fight

lawlessness, impurity, hatred between brothers and nations, and crookedness in high places.

The reason the Conference did not take such action twenty-five years ago is the reason we did not have the 18th Amendment fifty years ago: (1) this awful war had not been fought, (2) there were no men of vision to see the terrible havoc of war.

The men who plead for military preparedness and for war as the method to settle international disputes are pleading for the annihilation of the white race. The Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and this last World War was a war between brothers of the same race and blood. Every such war has weakened and killed off the best of the white race and has left the colored races to grow stronger. The colored races are not fighting each other. For the sake of the white races we must stop war. It is the sad spectable of Christians fighting Christians, civilized people fighting the same civilization in other countries. A sorry and idiotic state of affairs.

The God of War is my devil. I serve the God of Peace and good will. Dear old Charley McCabe, I know him so well, could not be put in the same class of sound thinking men with men like Bishop McConnell, Harry Emerson Fosdick, S. Parkes Cadman, and a host of other thinkers. If McCabe were here today and knew the setback the last war made upon missions he would be among the first to sign such an action as our Conference took. He put the success of Christianity above the sound of cannon, always.

The literature on this anti-war movement is most notable and high class. Wish you could read up on it.

My best wishes to you.

Ever yours, ——

January 8, 1926.

———, Ohio.

COLONEL SMITH'S ANSWER.

January 19, 1926.

Rev. ———

Dear Brother ——— :

Your reply to my letter of January 3rd arrived the 13th.

I am pleased indeed that our old friendship constrained you to answer my letter. While you term it a "letter of protest," I did not send it as such. I sent it, as I said, from a friend to a friend; I sent it in order that, while giv-

ing you my view, I might learn yours. Your replying in the terms of your introduction, carries the implication that I am sincere in my views; may I not, then, logically ask you to believe that the thousands of Christian Americans who believe as I do on this question, are also sincere? If a difference of opinion be prima facie evidence of insincerity, then who shall be held competent to judge which side is sincere, and which is not?

May I jump, right here, to your last sentence: "The literature on this anti-war movement is most notable and high-class; wish you would read up on it." If my memory of you were not so vivid, I should be persuaded by that sentence that you are, just a wee bit sarcastically, implying that I am talking without having heard both sides. I must say then, that for some years I have been studying, closely and constantly, the leaders of your group. So clearly, indeed that I recognized them as old acquaintances when I met them in your letter.

But this matter is not being pressed upon you by me with the least desire to begin or to continue an argument. I am a son of the North-East Ohio Conference; I am, while that relationship exists, as deeply bound to follow the leadership of my church as her pastors are. And since that is true, it must follow that in any question effecting my conduct and procedure, I must go to the root of things. My Methodism means that much to me—it would not be worthy if it meant any less. And I write to you, as my only acquaintance among the proponents of the pacifistic Conference resolution.

I note that several of the points touched upon in my first letter were no covered by your reply. I note, also, in your letter, certain statements which are erroneous, and evidence the fact that you have false information. May I not, then, for the sake of brevity and clarity, summarize the points treated by you and then tersely restate my viewpoint upon them?

Summary of Your Letter.

Statement of Rev. ——

1. "It was with mingled astonishment * * * that I read your protest to the action of the greatest conference in Methodism. The action was fostered by the leading men of the conference. * * Only two men took exception."

Reply by LeRoy F. Smith.

1. The Conference minutes, over the signature of the Conference Secretary

and the Presiding Bishop, says the resolution was "passed by a small majority." Since there are more than 500 members, we may say that a "small majority" would not be more than 300. That means that 200 took enough exception to vote "No."

2. "Only two took exception and they are small minded men in the small churches of the conference."

2. (a) If that were not such a gross insult to your own sainted father, who was a small church pastor, I would be led to look upon it as an insult to my minister father. For, as shown by the Conference records, both your father and mine gave their entire ministerial lives to the "small town" pastorates. But they had good minds, even though as militantly patriotic as they were militantly Christian.

3. "I can see that your arguments (which are the stock arguments used by all militarists) are colored by your relations to the National Guards."

3. (a) "Stock arguments." If by "stock arguments" you mean, "handed out by some agency with no personal analysis of their merit," I can truthfully deny it. I read more of your propaganda than I do of that of my own group. (There is so much more of it to read.) If you mean by "stock," that they are the arguments frequently proposed by folks who think as I do, I agree with you fully. And if that be so—if they are the opinions held by so many of us, may they not be worthy of more careful attention?

(b) "Militarists." Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary, 1919 Edition, gives the following definitions: "Militarism—The giving of undue prominence to military training and to military glory; warlike or military spirit; used mostly in reference to European policy of maintaining great standing armies."

Militarist—"(1) One who believes in or advocates militarism; (2) One devoted to military life or affairs." You, and those who hold with you, would say, following the first part of the first definition, that since all preparedness is unnecessary and wrong, I am militaristic if I advocate an army of a single squad. The argument, of course, begs the question, and in therefore inadmissable. The term is in fact habitually used, as is well known to both of us, in the sense of implying that America is following the lead of those European nations of which the old Germany was a shining, but by no means the only example. The law under

which America prepares her national defense, the law which we favor and support, the National Defense Act of June, 1920, is pronouncedly and definitely and unequivocally anti-militaristic in the following fundamental particulars: (1) It limits the size of our standing army to an actual number of troops much smaller than those of any other World Power; (2) it provides that the civilian, instead of the professional soldier, shall serve as our principal defense; and (3) it provides, as do our Constitution and all our laws, that our people, through their President and Congress, can alone commit the Army to action.

Your policeman engages in combat the moment his judgment decides it to be necessary; your soldier never has, never will, and never can, move a foot or load a piece until you tell him to do so, by official, slow, and complicated means. I challenge you to name a single war, a single battle, a single skirmish, undertaken by your soldiery except by due process of your civil laws.

PACIFISTIC IGNORANCE

4. "I can see that your arguments are colored by your relations to the National Guard."

4. (a) Here is shown that unfamiliarity with your plan of National Defense which is so characteristic. I signed my letter, "Lieutenant Colonel, Reserve, United States Army." By that signature the well-in-formed would have recognized a civilian clerk, or farmer, or business or professional man, carrying on his peaceful vocation, and receiving an average of three days of active military training per year—little enough, if, as has happened at least once in each generation of our national life, his sort should be asked by his country to lead a company of her untrained sons to the common defense of humanity.

The Reserves are a group of mature men who have experienced the bitter consequences of our nation's former carelessness, and a group of younger men whose patriotic vision seeks to render impossible a repetition of that carelessness in the future. By study and training, for the most part in correspondence schools and little group conferences, all upon their own time and at their own expense, these citizens simply seek that measure of skill before the event which will enable them to avoid the necessity of their gaining this experience in battle, at the expense of your boy's life.

The National Guard, however, is one of the component bodies of our National

Defense. It, too, is composed of civilians who unslfishly give of their time and energy for the protection alike of those who appreciate and those who deride their sacrifical service. The National Guardsman, indeed, has a two-fold allegiance; and whether a flood or other disaster menace his State, or an invasion threaten his Nation, he pours on the altar his long arduous hours of study and drill and preparation. He lays down his life, and calls it a day; and asks but the privilege of such training as will give him an even break.

5. "Those who say the 18th Amendment is wrong, argue as you do * * *. They condemn Christian people for interfering with their rights."

5. (a) We who believe in National Defense have no rights which we hold to be interfered with, unless you mean to deny us the right of opinion. We are pleading for no rights; we are pleading for the establishment of a national policy. Absolutely the only right we can see endangered is the right for us to reasonably prepare ourselves for such a call as you, as so often before, may make upon us.

6. "Seventy years ago it was thought right to drink alcoholic drinks and sell it. The time came when Christian said, "the saloon must go!"

6. (a) Seventy years ago, and seven hundred years ago, there were many righteous people who were trying to find a way to curb the ill effects of drink. In the Assyrian political code of Hammurabi, which was formulated and in operation one thousand five hundred years before Moses brought the decalogue down from Sinai, we find laws regulating the sale of liquor. "We climb the ladder rung by rung." We climb slowly and painfully, and with many a set back. As we climbed the ladder of Temperance we had to protect ourselves on every hand from those who were not ready to climb with us, and who hated to see us climb. As we climb the ladder of universal brotherhood and good will, we are compelled to protect the banner of peace which we carry, from the onslaughts of those who refuse to enlist under it.

7. "Most historians think that the slave business could have been settled in a more humane way than by war."

7. (a) Most historians say exactly the opposite of that. If there be any series of American historical facts more generally known than others, it is the story of the forty-year effort, by every conceivable compromise known to the wisest statesmen of their day, to arrive at a

workable agreement, around a hundred council tables, upon the questions which finally caused that terrible flame of the Civil War. Those herculean efforts came to their beautiful and masterful climax in Lincoln's First Inauguaral Address. No man may read that simple, yet profound presentment, in the light of even a slight acquaintance with its background, without some sense of the effort being made to placate the sentiments of hatred and animosity. If you meant to say, "All historians think the slavery question ought to have been settled without resort to war" —I agree—and so does every sane man.

8. "England freed her slaves without war; we should be as wise as the English."

8. (a) England maintains a reasonable measure of National Defense too. We should be as wise as the English.

9. "England freed her slaves without war."

9. (a) What of it? Not only England, but America, and every other nation in history, have settled thousands of questions without war. I may catch the weeds in my garden at a favorable season, and kill them all by a half-hour's pulling; you may find yourself with a growth so rank that you must hoe, and scythe, and burn, for days.

Besides that, can you not conceive that the danger menacing one nation may influence another to avoid a similar trouble?

BLANKET ASSERTIONS

10. "War has never settled anything."

10. (a) This is one of those blanket assertions too often risked by many of us. It is very "boomerangy" in its nature, and I would not recommend it. You might have said, "War has never settled anything that might not more profitably have been settled otherwise."

A few, only a few, refutations to your statement; (1) The Revolutionary War settled the sovereignty of the United States of America; that was acknowledged by Great Britian in Article One of the peace treaty, and still "goes," to the best of my information. (2) The Revolutionary War settled the principle of the American Constitutional Government, which was an immediate and proximate result of that conflict. (3) The War of 1812 settled the question of the impressment of American seamen. (4) The War of 1812 settled the question of the boundaries between the United States and British possessions. (5) The Civil War settled the matter of secession. (6) The Civil War settled slavery

in the United States, and went far toward hastening its settlement everywhere else. (7) The Spanish-American War settled Spain. (8) The David Goliath War settled Goliath. Ad infinitum.

11. "After the smoke has cleared away, men must get together around a table and come to terms. Why not come to terms without the debacle of fighting?"

11. (a) I'll bite: why do they not? I only know, that in hundreds of instances they do not. Any policeman knows that. I will work with you or with anybody, to influence men and nations to get together around a table. So will any decent man.

12. "The black man is still a problem unsettled by wars that freed him."

12. (a) What is your implication? That he should not have been freed? Shades of Lincoln and Harriet Beecher Stowe!

12. (b) You say, though, that wars freed him. I thought you said wars never accomplished anything.

SLAVERY?

13. "I've heard many an old soldier say that he would not fight to free the negro had he the chance to do it over again."

13. How many?

Honestly now, my dear friend, are you proud of that statement? If your cause be so impeccably just, must you resort to this to maintain it?

14. "This last war * * *was misrepresented and fostered by propaganda."

14. (a) You should have put quotation marks around that. Dozens of them.

15. "Those horried stories of Belgium atrocities were sheer propaganda of hate and revenge. We have the letters and speeches of English and Canadian officers who have on many occasions confessed the same in mirth."

15. In the last sentence of your letter, as alluded to by me in my introduction, you asked me to read up on your anti-war literature. I have, and I shall continue to do so. I now ask you to do me two favors: first, read any two of the books I shall list for you herewith; and second, write me sincerely your opinion then, as to whether you should modify the statement which I have quoted from your letter.

Let me say this before I proceed with the list: Neither I, nor the proponents of national preparedness generally, desire in any way to break open the old healing sores. Neither during the war nor since, were the actions of the American soldier characterized by a hatred of the German

soldier or citizen. Our "boys" in Germany married hundreds of their young ladies. As an officer, I have met socially, and have been delighted to meet, officers of the German army. Our nations are at peace, and both sides welcome that peace with the utmost sincerity. You raised the question of Belgium horrors and atrocities. I have personal documentary evidence that you are mistaken and you can satisfy yourself of the fact that you are mistaken, if you will but take the trouble to walk to your city library. May I suggest that the source from which such palable misstatements emanate, should be looked upon with suspicion? In other words, if you catch your informants in one material falsehood, should you not view all of their statements with doubt?

Here, then, a partial list of books upon this subject, with certain excerpts from official documents. Should you still doubt, I will be glad to forward you sworn true copies of such excerpts.

(a) The Barbarians in Belgium. Nathomb, Jarold & Sons, London, Publishers.

(b) The German Terror in France. Toynbee, Hodder & Stroughton, New York.

(c) The German Fury in Belgium. Nokveid. (A Dutch Netherland: neutral War Correspondent.) Hodder & Stoughton, New York.

(d) Official Book of the German Atrocities. The complete verbatim Report of the Belgian, French and Russian Commissions of Inquiry. C. Arthur Pearson, Ltd., London.

(e) German Atrocities: An Official Investigation. By J. H. Morgan, Home Office Commissioner. T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., London.

Excerpts. (1) Extract of a Proclamation to the Communal Authorities of Liege. August 22, 1914: "It was with my consent that the General had the whole place burnt down, and about 100 people shot. The General Commanding-in-Chief, Von Bulow."

(2) Extract, Diary of Gaston Klein, 1st Landsturm Company, August 29, 1914: "First only a few troops entered town (Louvain) but then the battalion entered in close ranks (i. e., under orders) and broke into the houses to loot * * *. It was like a pack of hounds let loose; every one did what he liked. The officers led the way and gave good example."

(3) Extract, Letter of Lieut. General Von Nieber to the Burgomeister of Wavre, August 27, 1914: "I order you

to hand over to bearer two million francs ($400,000) in gold. I also ask that a letter be sent, sealed with the town seal, declaring the balance, one million francs ($200,000) will be paid without default on September 1. * * * The town of Wavre will be set on fire and destroyed if the payment is not made when due; without distinction of persons, the innocent will suffer for the guilty. Von Neiber, Lieut. General."

The pretended excuse was that the citizens fired at German troops; it was later proven false; but more than fifty houses were pillaged and burned.

(4) Extract, Report of Commission of Inquiry "The (Belgian) soldiers Goffin, Heyvaerts and Hertleer, having been captured by the Germans, were bound and placed in front of the German firing line, where two of them fell, shot down by the bullets of their comrades." (Evidence at the Session of Sept. 19, 1914.)

My eye chances to turn at this moment, to another type of atrocity. I am not going to quote, even to you. You may read of some of them beginning on page 112 of the book (d) cited above. You can read more in the Congressional Library. When I can, I will have made for you copies of two photographs in my possession. They were given me by a minister who was on the ground; they they were taken by one of the most eminent surgeons of Cleveland, Ohio.

The first wounded American officer I came to know showed me his hands, with the tendons of both wrists severed beyond repair (hamstrung, as it were) by German surgeons while he was a prisoner of war. He had not been wounded in the wrists; the excuse of "accidents of surgery" may not, therefore, be made.

Enough; you and I know it happened.

16. "The present wave of crime and the moral slump into which we have been thrown is attributed to the last war."

16. (a) The average age of our criminals today is so far below the legal voting age of 21 years as to occasion more discussion, by press, pulpit, and sociologists than perhaps any other current topic. The 21-year old was only 13 years old when the war began. The war-cause theory is but one of a hundred theories. It is the one which seems to be losing ground in authoritative journals, while the opinion on the other hand gains ground, that the nation-wide sacrifices and attention to an idealistic cause, occasioned a temporary let-up, during 1917 and 1918, of a national trend toward lawlessness which had been noted as de-

veloping with much seriousness in the 7 or 8 years prior to the war.

(b) For practically the whole period since the war my work has been among the ex-service men. I am able positively and utterly to refute the statement which has sometimes been made (mostly from up-holstered chairs) that the veteran has a prepondering predilection to crime. Every town has its veteran organization; and the welfare officer of every group will find this personal experience of mine familiar: I was called to the county jail of Los Angeles County to render assistance to a supposed buddy. I found him. I also found that, preying on the sympathies of a rather deficient veteran, twenty-eight non-veterans in that jail had borrowed the veteran's service button, one by one, on the days when they had gone before the judge for trial! We do not pretend to know who our criminals are; but we certainly do know who they are not.

SHERMAN WAS RIGHT

17. "War is always hell."

17. (a) Amen! That is the testimony of a soldier; it is loudly assented to by every other soldier. Which fact should make the thinking person ponder when he knows that, while the veteran has that belief,, he still stands firmly for preparedness. The reason is clear; the American soldier sees, from a most distressingly intimate viewpoint, that in all the wars which his nation has sent him into, a very considerable part of his hell has been caused by lack of preparation for his task. As I told you in my first letter, any graveyard in America will tell you that. Young men came back to ——, Ohio, in wooden boxes, who would have marched back if they had a bit of military training before 1917. Look up their organization records for that.

18 (a) "This war was a victory for the wrong people. (b) The war was won politically by France, (c) financially by America, and (d) religiously by the Roman Catholics."

18. (a) Who should have won it? The Allies did win it. And the armies of the Allies cannot be blamed because, after the war, around the tables, the political adjustments were fumbled. Why did not your round table diplomats do their stuff?

(b) What you mean by France winning the war politically is not clear. A walk over the shell-holes of northern France would make it difficult for you to object if she did succeed in putting a neutral zone between herself and an age-

long foe. If the ownership of Alsace-Lorraine is a moral Tweedledum and Tweedledee, I still fail to find that Tweedledum is naughtier than his eminent sparring partner.

(c) If, as you assert, the war was won financially by America, then I must point out that America made her financial winnings by abstaining for three years from entering the war. If certain individual profiteers reaped a harvest, that fact had no relation to America's conduct of the war, or to her attitude thereafter. You are aware of our magnanimity in the matter of all territorial rights, indemnities and other perquisites which might have been demanded, but were not. If we won financially, why your roar at paying a five-spot per year for National Defense?

(d) You say the war was won religiously by the Roman Catholics. I confess an abysmal ignorance of what you are driving at, there. But here's a little pair of stories which seems to fit in pretty well. First one, Private John Jones is dying in the Base Hospital, Camp Sherman, Ohio. John is a Methodist boy. He says to his Captain, who is sitting by his bedside, "Captain, I'd like to have a preacher to talk to me before taps sound." His Captain goes to get a chaplain. He finds one, Chaplain Father Nolan, of the Church of Rome. The Captain says to the priest, 'Father, one of my boys is dying in Ward 8; he is a Methodist boy; he wants a chaplain to pray for him." "I'll go with you." the chaplain replied. And Chaplain Father Nolan, of the Church of Rome, kneels beside this dying Methodist boy and prays. And in substance, this was his prayer: "Our Father who art in Heaven, wilt thou smooth the couch of this young soldier. He is preparing to come to Thee. Give him faith to realize that the Christ of John Wesley is his Christ; that the God of the generations of pious mothers and fathers of Methodism is his loving Father. Assist him in this hour of passing, to put his trust in Him who alone is ever trustworthy. Let him say with the blessed Apostle, St. Paul, I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith.' In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost Amen."

My dear Brother ——, I was the captain who called that priest, and heard that prayer for my comrade and Methodist brother.

Second story. Hamline Methodist Episcopal Church, one of the most beau-

tiful in all Methodism, was dedicated last week (January 7, 1926). The leading clergymen of the churches of Washington are present to bid this congregation God-speed in their new sanctuary. The pastor announces the hymn. It is Number 415, one of the hymns your congregation sung last week. It is the grand old tune, St. Catherine; the hymn is, "Faith of Our Fathers;" and behind the pulpit, singing from the same hymnal, stand side by side Rabbi Abram Simon, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, and Father P. C. Gavan, of Sacred Heart Catholic Church. And, among a half-dozen other clergymen, these two, Rabbi and Priest, address the people with ringing words of felicitation, faith and hope.

I am no more Catholic than you; I can't agree with many of their points of doctrine or discipline. But somehow, I have seemed to find for my own self, in Catholic churches, Dunker churches, Hebrew churches, and others where I have on occasion worshipped, the truth of the Scriptural saying, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there will I be found in the midst of them." There is one thing the war did spoil a lot of us soldiers for; it took the edge off of our hatred for the chap who approaches his God in different style from ours. If that be Methodist treason, make the most of it.

19. "When you say we have never been prepared, you place an awful blot upon the military forces in our country."

19. (a) When I say we have never been prepared for a single conflict in which our nation has engaged, I say not only what every military man says, but I say what every page of history shouts.

What I am about to say may seem harsh; I beg of you, my friend, to receive it as from a friend who knows this subject better (I am sorry to say) than you. I am sorry to say it; for you are not only entertaining utterly false conceptions of your country's past deeds and of her possible future needs, but you are also spreading these false conceptions.

Hear me, then. Our country has never been prepared for a single war she has been engaged in. Our country has never been called upon to fight an enemy her size, from a military standpoint. (In fighting the Central Powers, she was of course associated with a group of powers who, with America, constituted a force greatly exceeding their foe.) In each of her wars, she has lost a considerable proportion of her casualties because the na-

tion refused to train the troops until the outbreak of war.

Two standard books upon that subject are, Military Policy of the United States, by Emory Upton, and Our Military Policy, by P. S. Bond. May I make again the request you made of me—that you "read up on it?"

I am placing no blot upon the military forces; I am but pointing out the blot upon the nation, in that it has fatuously sent its sons forth to be murdered by reason of their lack of training and equipment, once every generation of our national existence.

The military forces have always, somehow, accomplished many fold more than their pitiably small strength would warrant. The people have always been niggardly in the matter of supply, equipment, and training of their manpower, until they saw a war right in front of them, and then they have yowled with irresistible insistence for the government to dispatch troops at once. And the government is the people, and so the troops have answered the call, and have gone forth to their slaughter, at least fifty per cent of it needless slaughter, preventable slaughter. That characteristic was never more blatant than today. For such folks, it would seem that a most appropriate national anthem would be, "It Ain't Going to Rain No More.'

FIGURES AND FACTS

20. "87 per cent of our income goes out every year for war purposes."

20. (a) It does not. I am quite familiar with the specious text book whence you gleaned that false figure. You, like the text, attribute that statement to our President.

I quote from the official texts from which the President derives his intimate and unimpeachable knowledge of army expenditures. They are entitled, "Report of the Secretary of War, to the President, 1925," and "Digest of Appropriations, 1925," by A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury. Lest you still doubt, may I call your attention to the fact that not a department, not a bureau, not a commission, can spend a penny of Federal funds until it has been passed upon by the Director of the Budget, and that his totals are open to your inspection?

On pages 31 to 52 inclusive, of the Report of the Secretary of War to the President of the United States, is found the Statement of Appropriations made by our Government for the War Department for the Fiscal Year ending June 30,

1925. At the bottom of the second column on page 52, you may read the following facts:

(1) Total amount appropriated by Congress for Military activities for fiscal year ending June 30		$268,974,050.09
Total amount appropriated by Congress for non-Military activities for fiscal year ending June 30 (add)	79,549,836.89	
Total Army appropriation for all purposes—1925	$348,523,886.98	
Balance from year ending July 31, 1925 (add)	109,716,354.88	
Total funds apropriated		$458,240,241.86
Amount transferred between appropriations, not available for expenditures by War Department (add)	10,097,881.89	
Total available		$468,338,123.75
Carried to surplus fund June 30, 1925 (sub.)	9,245,825.50	
		$459,092,298.50
Balance unexpended June 30, 1925 (sub.)	139,333,296.96	
Total cost of the United States Army, both for Military and non-Military purposes, for the year ending June 30, 1925		$319,759,001.29

Now, I told you your army cost you about two dollars and a half last year. I acknowledge my error. The population of the United States today is at least 110,000,000. Divide the total cost of your army last year by 110,000,000. What is the answer? The answer is a shade less than two dollars and ninety-seven cents ($2.97). That is less than six cents per week, less than one penny per day!

But you protest here. You say I forgot the Navy. Well, let's look at the Navy. On page 310, Digest of Appropriations for the Support of the Government of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, published by A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, is found this item, at the foot of a 26-page tabulation of every penny appropriated.

Total of all money appropriated for the Navy, unexpended in 1924 and prior years	$ 1,392,606.22
Total appropriated for the Navy, fiscal year 1925	277,208,327.00
Total appropriated or available for the U. S. Navy, fiscal year 1925	278,600,933.22

That is to say, dividing again by our population, your Navy cost you this year, two dollars and fifty-three cents, or less than a nickel a week!

Both together, Army and Navy, for military and non-military purposes; for Alaska Cables and for the care of lepers in the Island of Guam; for the improvement of the Missouri River in North Dakota; for the harbor at Port Clinton, Ohio, and for the construction of road work in Alaska; for the care of Confederate burial plats and for the upkeep of the Naval Home in Philadelphia; for the national cemeteries and for the maintenance of the Washington Monument; and for every single aeroplane, cartridge, uniform, rifle, row boat, pound of coal or cake of soap—**for every penny paid for the national defense of our country**—you, I, and each and every recorded inhabitant of the United States of America dug up the sum of five dollars and fifty cents ($5.50)!

Now then—on page 493 of the Digest of Appropriations (Secretary Mellon's official report to the President of the United States) you will read this item:

Grand total of appropriations, 68th Congress, fiscal year 1925	$3,748,651,750.35
Less sinking fund, etc.	471,806,401.00
Grand total of appropriations, less sinking fund, etc, fiscal year 1925	$3,276,845,349.35

You said 87% of our Federal income goes out every year for **War Purposes.** The facts speak for themselves.

Army	$319,759,001.29
Navy	278,600,933.22
Army **and** Navy	$598,359,934.51
Total cost of the U. S. Government	$3,276,845,349.35

Which brings the following result:

The cost of the National Defense (including the Washington Monument, etc., etc.) is just seventeen and one-quarter per cent, (17¼%) of our total National expenditures! The difference between

your 87% and the true 17% is just 70%. In other words, your (borrowed) figures are 70% **wrong.**

"He is thrice armed, that hath his quarrel just." If your position be the righteous one, need you resort to those means to defend it?

But you protest again. I presume you do, for I observe you seated among the brethren who always do protest at this point. You protest that the cost of **past** wars should be added to the cost of protection from **future** emergency. I will agree to add that item, it you will agree that the following examples are fair, true, or usual bookkeeping methods:

To the upkeep cost of your **present** automobile, add all of the repair bills on all previous cars.

To your grocery bill this year, **add** your doctor bills from birth.

To your municipal police tax **this** year, **add** the cost of articles stolen from your home when your police were too few to protect it, last year.

To your fire insurance premium cost **this** year, **add** the damage accrued while your policy was lapsed last year.

To your overcoat expense **this** year **add** your time lost from the grippe last year.

The bookkeeper who would do these things, would be apt to throw away whatever thin, threadbare overcoat he has, and aver that it will never grow cold again.

21. "The attempt is being made to militarize colleges."

21. As I told you in my previous letter, there are no more college boys taking military training today than there were when you and I were in college, in proportion to the student enrollment or to the population.

From the students who are learning military discipline and tactics, including all purely military schools, so small a number ever pursue the military interest beyond the school year, that the annual induction into the Reserve Corps are but about 50% of the annual superannuations of officers. The entire enlisted reserve in the United States is less than the strength of three (3) infantry regiments. In battle, they would cover a front of less than six city blocks. The exact figure is 8,749!

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps, which is the modern expression of the old cadet battalions so familiar to the friends of Ohio Wesleyan University and scores of other schools, has been one of the bug-a-boos lately set up by the apostles of unpreparedness. It is a bug-a-boo made, not out of whole cloth, but

out of ragged and tattered cloth. The following figures from the June 30, 1925, Report of Secretary Davis to the President, should outweigh all less authentic statements: (Page 151 of the Report). There were, last year, in all of the high schools, colleges, and universities of our land, only 111,558 young men pursuing this course of physical training, discipline and military drill. If these young men are being militarized, we would quite logically expect to find them giving at least some attention to military work after they leave school. As I said in my first letter, this condition is not found to obtain. On this same page we find that only 4,153 accepted commissions, and 795 were given certificates entitling them to commissions at age 21. Let us see what that number represents, in terms of National Defense. If each one of these 4,153 young officers were skilled military leaders, and were assigned to infantry divisions, they would officer just a shade more than 4½ divisions. An infantry division cannot normally cover a front in excess of 3 miles. And so we see that our last year's procurement of young officers, from the militaristic atmosphere alleged to rest upon our institutions of learning, has given us the leadership of a force to protect a front of only 15 miles.

But even those figures are misleadingly large; for the report shows that 5,474 of the students in training were enrolled in the **non**-combatant arms, mostly doctors, dentists and veterinarians! As shown by these figures, which are not at all secret, only one out of 1,000 of our population, or only one out of 100 of our school population (if 10% of us are in school) are pursuing this military training. We see, further, that 23% (approaching one-quarter of the whole number) are doing their drilling with surgeon's probes, dentist's drills, or veterinary drenching bottles. And lastly, we see that out of the **one-thousandth** part of our population, or the **one-hundredth** part of our school population who are getting any sort of military education, less than five per cent (5%) are found, after school is over, to be affiliated with the Army! That is but one American out of every twenty thousand, or one pupil out of every two thousand.

If, in the City of ——, Ohio, only one person out of every one hundred **attended** any church, and if only one person out of every two thousand actually **joined** any church, would you say that

the people had gone crazy over religion? It would be necessary to import men to serve as sextons.

Few habits seem more common in these days than that of adopting a phrase, clothing it with a special meaning, and the parading it on all possible manufactured occasions. Our latest shapely fashion model is the word "militarism." For years, our Cincinnati friends have used as a slogan, "It Floats," and we who would wash, buy it because it floats, not realizing that the more it floats the more air we have to buy, and the less real soap. The word "Militarism" is beginning to float.

22. "Every nation that has perpetuated (sic) itself by the sword has perished by the sword."

22. I won't laugh at that. I won't. Much.

(a) Any nation which has perpetuated itself hasn't perished.

(b) Every nation which has perished at all, has perished by the sword (or by whatever sort of snickersnee was in fashion at the time.)

(c) Practically every nation which has ever risen, has established itself by means of its military man-power. That includes the Jewish nation, which gave us our basic faith, and our Lord. That includes Greece, which gave us our art and philosophy. That includes Rome, which gave us our common law. That includes Great Britain, which gave us our Magna Charta (at the point of a sword). And that includes the United States of America, which for a century and a half has made it possible for a people to enjoy in unparalleled security the fruitage of all of these contributions, and a thousand besides.

WHO BUILT THE TEMPLE?

23. "David was not allowed to build the beautiful temple the Lord had planned, because he was a man of war."

23. That is David's own statement, in First Chronicles, 28:3.

But he did build it. He built it just as much as I build my house when I hire the carpenter, and mason, and painter, and furnish the cash and the design and the furniture. Read on with me in that same chapter. "And thou, Solomon, my son, take heed: The Lord hath chosen thee to build an house for the sanctuary; be strong, and do it." Then David gave to Solomon the son the pattern of the porch, the houses, the treasuries, the upper chambers, the inner parlors, and of the mercy seat; and the pattern of all

that he had (given to him, i. e., David) by the Spirit.

And **then** read, beginning at verse 14; "He (David) gave gold bullion and silver bullion, and pure gold, and refined gold," and so on. **And where did he get all this wealth?** Turn to Chapter 18 of the same book: "And David smote Hadarezer, King of Zobah, and took from him 1000 chariots, and 1000 cavalrymen, and 20,000 infantrymen; and when the Syrians came to help Hadarezer, David slew 22,000 of them; and he put garrisons in Syria-damascus; and the Syrians became David's servants, and **brought gifts.**" "Thus the Lord preserved David whithersoever he went." I Chron. 18:6. "And David took the shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadarezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. Likewise David brought from the cities of Hadarezer very much brass, **wherewith** Solomon made the brazen sea and the pillars (Jachin and Boaz) and the vessels of brass."

Kipling would call it "Loot;" but then Kipling is a Gentile.

24. "There have been three plagues that have wrecked every nation thus far; Famine, Pestilence, and War. We have conquered famine through Agriculture and Commerce. We have conquered Pestilence by the science of medicine and sanitation. At Washington do we have a Secretary of Disease and a Secretary of Famine? Of course not. And yet we have **two** Secretaries of War—a Secretary of the Army and a Secretary of the Navy."

24. (a) Why don't we have a Secretary of Famine? You have just said that we have conquered famine through Agriculture and Commerce. And we **do have a Secretary of Agriculture**, and a **Secretary of Commerce** and **Labor.**

(b) Why don't we have a Secretary of Disease? You have just said that we have conquered disease by the science of medicine and sanitation. And we have the U. S. Public Health Service with a budget above nine millions, besides the Bureau of Chemistry, Bureau of Entomology, Bureau of Biological Survey, Bureau of Homes Economics, Horticultural Board, Bureau of Plant and of Animal Industry, and others all of which constantly conrtibute to the national health. Besides, **Major** Walter Reed and some of his brave volunteering soldiers gave their lives and scotched yellow fever; **General** Gorgas and his soldiers took captive the malaria at Panama; and the **Army** conquered the hookworm when it occupied Porto Rico. And the Army

sealed the doom of typhoid and paratyphoid. And in 1918, in Camp Sherman, Ohio, 99% of the venereal cases brought the disease with them from civil life, as against (1) per cent who contracted it in service. The Army discovered for you in the late war that 50% of the youth of America were suffering from physical defects which would prove disabling, for peace or war; and the Army gives expert medical attention and service to every school boy who dons the uniform.

THE SECRETARY OF PEACE

25. "Why not have a Secretary of Peace?"

25. We do. And he is the highest ranking member of the Cabinet. So greatly do we hold his office in esteem that, next to the Vice-President, it is he who would fill the Presidental chair if the latter were to die. He is called the Secretary of State. Do you suppose any month goes by in which the Secretary of State does not handle delicate international affairs which, if left to themselves, would breed war? And this Secretary of Peace, whom we call the Secretary of State, has his able assistants in the cities of every foreign land on this globe, learning the viewpoint and trend of thought of all peoples, and using that added understanding constantly in the interest of Peace.

And here in our capital stands the chaste and imposing building of the Pan-American Union, where the flags of 21 American Republics hang side by side, and where 21 chairs, each carved with a different coat of arms, encircle a single oaken table. And on one side of this shrine of peace stands the splendid building of the Daughters of the American Revolution; and on the other side stands the building erected to the memory of the heroic women of the Civil War, and now occupied by the American Red Cross, the child of the brain of an Army nurse.

26. "The hand of God has never been on the side of the best equipped army, but always on the side of the right."

26. Do you mean by that statement, that if the **right** side had had **no** equipment, that side would have won anyhow? Then why were so many bloody sacrifices necessary before the right side gained the victory? And why did God lead the Israelites around in the wilderness for forty years for the purpose of developing and hardening their manpower, before he led them out to victory (victory

accomplished by war)? In any event, since right always wins, you admit that God has always been on the side of one of the armies.

27. "If a nation is right it can never be destroyed."

27. Then, if a home is right, it can never be burglarized. If a man is right, he will never be attacked by foot-pads.

And therefore, the promise which you and I have taken, "to fly to the relief of a brother in danger," is a silly, unnecessary and meaningless provision.

You say, in effect, that Belgium was unrighteous. You say, in effect, that the oppressed Cubans were unrighteous. Or, if you say, "No, they were righteous, for God saved them from utter destruction," then I reply, "Yes; but He used **soldiers** and **warfare** as His **agents** to save them."

28. "Lincoln, the commander of the military forces, said he did not pray for God to be on his side, but that **he** might be always sure that he was on God's side."

28. You have done well to call attention to the fact that Lincoln **was** the commander of the military forces. You will do well to recall that, having, on his knees, determined that his cause **was** righteous, he utilized those military forces including your father and my uncles, and Bishop McCabe, to protect and preserve that righteous principle.

29. "The Church was blamed because it did not prevent the World War."

29. **Who** blamed it? Principally the adherents to the cause of the enemy, who, of course, used all means in their power to prevent the entrance of America into the combat. No right-minded person blames the Church for not preventing that war, any more than they would blame our late President Wilson for not preventing it. As logically, blame the Church for not preventing the Johnstown Flood.

MARRIAGE VS. HATRED

30. "War only deepened the hatred between the countries."

30. Is that why 475 of the German lasses married American soldiers?

31. "Take away the profits of the war, and we will have no more wars."

31. (a) The attitude at this point is unjust, in that it implies that I, or my group, **want** war. It that will cure war, why should **I**, more than **you**, get busy to do away with those profits?

(b) As a matter of fact, I, more than you, am acting to accomplish that very thing. For I, through the American Le-

gion, the great body of veterans, have come out boldly and repeatedly for that. And at this very minute there is a bill in Congress, supported by the American Legion and by many other patriotic groups, to accomplish that purpose.

(c) Was the Revolution designed by profiteers? Was the War of 1812 conducted for profit? Did the Congress of the United States engaged in the Civil War for profit

Did William McKinley send our brothers to Cuba for profit?

America profited for three years by staying out of the World War. Many of us think she helped to clean her temple when she finally came to the decision to pay less attention to profit and more to service—the service of democracy and humanity.

32. "Compel the men who make or declare war to go to the front and do the real fighting, and there will be no more wars."

32. (a) That much bandied pronouncement is not susceptible of much intelligible analysis.

War is declared, of course, by the President and the Congress,. Depriving the nation of her legislative and executive leaders in time of war would of course only add to its cost and its horrors, even supposing them to be adapted to any real service at the front. In the last war, as in any future conflict, there is the provision for the employment of our man-power where each individual may render his best meed of service.

((b) In the last analysis, of course, the nation, the people, and citizenry, are they who declare and make war. If McKinley had followed the will of the people, he would have declared war nine weeks before he did.

(c) Most of our young Congressmen today **did** go to war. Have we noted in the any hostility toward national defense?

33. "I have heard the **noblest** ex-service men say, "Never again; the next war will be an officers war."

33. You and I entertain different concepts of nobility.

Throughout the services, the **last** war was popularly known as a "Lieutenant's War," for the reason that the modern methods of war made their mortality so high. It was a common saying, in the trenches, when a sergeant was promoted to a lieutenantcy—"Well, here's to Sergeant Jones, now Lieutenant Jones; tonight he will be either a Captain or a corpse."

Your statement is a gratuitious, but I

believe an unintentional insult to the great body of veterans who, coming back from the war, banded themselves into the societies of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion, and in each and all of these societies, laid down as their prime plank, the support of the Constitution of their country; and who, through these societies and outside of them, have unceasingly since the war plead with the people to provide for a sane policy for the National Defense.

ADMITS POLICE NECESSARY

34. "We have to use locks to prevent stealing.

"We have to police city and nation under present conditions of morals."

34. (a) The sad fact that our "present conditions of morals," in the most enlightened nation on the globe, are such that American criminals today necessitate a police force much larger than our entire army (which you know is the case), is one of the very strongest arguments for national defense. Do you know that your army has been called upon one hundred and fifteen (115) times to give **internal** protection, but only twelve (12) times to engage with a foreign foe?

At this very writing, it would take some hours before a paltry 1,000 soldiers could be mobilized for defense in the capital of our Republic. We are not militaristic; we come precious near to being fatuistic.

(b) Why do we not, in spite of "our present state of morals," disarm our police, and settle with these things, "around a table?" Because you would write to your councilman about it pronto; because you have valuables in your home which you want to keep.

I went to church this morning, a Methodist church. I asked the usher where I might hang my overcoat. He replied, "You had better take it with you to your pew; we have had some overcoats stolen from the church lately." And so the ushers are on guard to protect me from thieves while I worship. Would they let a thief walk in under their eyes and make away with a coat? Would you? (Lest some not of the Methodist faith grow vain, let me say that I repeated that question to the usher in a Congregational Church, that same Sunday evening, and got the self-same warning!)

35. "'Policing' and 'war' are two very different things. Policing is to pro-

tect. War is planned in cold blood to destroy."

35. Policing it to **protect** the innocent by destroying (if necessary) the guilty.

How is a policeman equipped to protect? In his protection of you and me, since the close of the World War, he has destroyed more men than were killed in the American Expeditionary Forces. And not a day passes but that a brave police officer lays down his life for your protection.

The police departments, like the national police, who are our soldiery, plan, as of course they must, for the measures which will serve to protect. That is why every police department maintains a pistol and a rifle range.

War is planned to destroy; but the soldiery do not plan the wars. They go only when sent by the people who need them. It is not of record that the military leaders of America have in a single instance planned to involve the nation in war.

36. "Every person who has taken the lead in any reform has been minunderstood, maligned, and opposed."

36. Very true. In this instance, the reformer will be opposed by a great body of people, (who **also** may be not without sincerity) who think the time is not quite ripe for us to act exactly contrary to all of the piled up experience of the race.

He will be misunderstood by those who find him applying customary logic and reason to **other** lines of thought, but failing to view this matter in the same way.

Although misunderstood and opposed, he will **not** be maligned, if always, in his argument for his side, he will display perfect honesty and sincerity. When he uses arguments which he is in a position easily to ascertain to be false, he opens his guard to malignity. No one **malings** Voliva for arguing that the earth is flat instead of round; they **would** malign him if he preached that Chicago is a tropical seaport. They think he believes what he says.

HEROIC DEFENDERS

37. "The men in this movement are the ablest ministers, the most heroic citizens, the most willing to **defend the honor** of country under **all** circumstances."

37. The most willing to defend the honor of country under **all** circumstances. **All** circumstances, of course, must include the attack of our people a few years ago by banditti on the Mexi-

can border. These banditti had rifles, pistols, machine guns, commanders, discipline, training and military plans. Also, they had no scruples. They came suddenly and destroyed ruthlessly. What is the job of these ministers in this case? Here is what happened: civilian soldiers like myself, and Regular Army boys like my comrades, got between the banditti and the inhabitants, and utilized rifles, and commanders, and discipline, and training, and military plans, and saved the lives of Methodists and what not. Do you suppose all these arrangements were made after the banditti started firing?

You withhold the conference's sanction and support of such defense. You seek to cause a state of affairs which would mean that the next time any circumstance like that recurs, there will be no men, no equipment, no military plans. Today, as I write, hardy, trained, watchful American soldiers are patrolling the Texas border, protecting Methodists from this sort of thing. You refuse to sanction them. Write to your ministerial collegues in Columbus, New Mexico; get them to withdraw their support of military training. Write to Dayton, or Springfield, or San Francisco, or Galveston, or Chicago, and tell the preachers to excommunicate the Methodist soldiers who sprang to their aid against flood, fire, riot, pillage, war.

A preacher's son is not too good for service like this. No citizen is too good for such service.

How are your able ministers willing to defend the honor of their country under all circumstances? The least thing they can do is to support their fellow citizens who are willing to devote their time, and toil, and money to keep themselves somewhat prepared for such emergencies.

38. "Please remember that the Methodists have always been leaders in every reform."

38. Like yourself, I was born in a Methodist parsonage. My mother was born in a Methodist parsonage. We have always been in those reforms, as leaders. We are still in.

39. "We Methodists lead in the greatest reform of all—preparing the way to eliminate War."

39. We most certainly do. For example, the President sends an outstanding Methodist leader, Dr. von Klein Smid, President of a great Methodist University, on a wonderful mission to the South American Republics, to help in strengthening the cords of amity and goodwill. And Dr. KleinSmid preaches at once the

Gospel of Friendship and the Gospel of Christ. May I point out that **Doctor** von KleinSmid is **Colonel** von **KleinSmid**, Staff Specialist, U. S. Army Reserves?

Why, of course we are leading in the reform of preparing the way to eliminate war. Also, we are leading in the reform to eliminate banditry, to eliminate murder, to eliminate arson, to eliminate disease. Do we disband the police, while we prosecute this reform against crime? Do we disband the fire departments, in view of our hope for a future inflammable building material?

40. "Whenever we say a thing is wrong, its days are numbered."

40. Then I say, right now, "Murder is wrong; social vice is wrong; selfishness is wrong; theft is wrong; poverty is wrong." If I had known that that would number their days, I would have said it long ago. Why didn't somebody say it?

41. "I would like to see the day when we will learn war no more."

41. Me and you both. And everybody else outside of Matteawan.

42. "As long as we prepare for war we will have war."

42. As everyone familiar with American History knows, the United States has been disastrously unprepared for every war she has engaged in. If Belgium had not been such a warlike power, I suppose she would not have been invaded. Every Swiss citizen is prepared; yet Switzerland is a peaceful nation, untormented by wars. Mexico is unprepared for war, but continually having wars.

Our army never bred a war; but our wars have mobilized our armies.

43. "Instead of spending 87% of our good American money for bloodshed, and only 2% for education, if we would reverse, etc., we would be able to do without war."

MORE FACTS

43. With regard to that gross misstatement about "87%," whose falsity has been proven by official documents, open to everybody, please see **Paragraph 18**, above.

Your statement, gleaned in the same place as its mate, that we spend but two per cent (2%) for education, is unworthy of a place in an honest mind, even as ammunition for a great reform.

You are aware that the great functions of primary, secondary, and higher education are vested in the States, and not in the Federal Government. You are aware, or you **should** be aware, that you pay twice as much tax to your State, Coun-

ty, and municipality as you do to the Federal Government. You are also aware that the Federal Government, through its Bureau of Education, is constantly and increasingly engaged in a most comprehensive and exhaustive research, and is in the closest co-operation with and co-ordination of every phase of education.

You should be aware, and you could without difficulty be aware of the fact that this Bureau of the Federal Government is in intimate touch with the development, not only of the general educational means of our country, but also with the great activities of Indian education, Vocational education, the education of defectives, delinquents, and the like, and with the almost limitless modern problem of adult education.

The total figures of our nation's expenditures for educational purposes, are impossible to determine exactly, because of the fact, already pointed out, that education is a State, or a private function, and not a Federal function.

But to say that the people do not spend a given sum for education, simply because they do not pay it through a certain channel, is exactly like saying that you do not pay for a suit of clothes because you write a check on the Farmer's Bank instead of the First National Bank.

From a statement over the signature of Dr. Frank M. Phillips, Chief, Division of Statistics, Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C., dated January 16, 1926, I copy the following partial figures:

1924: Expenditures for only 930 reporting colleges and universities	$ 387,694,609.00
1924: Expenditures for teachers, colleges and normal schools	48,948,518.00
1924: Public school, Alaska	471,439.00
1924: Government supported schools in Alaska	346,281.00
1924: Government Indian schools	6,347,797.00
1922: Schools of the deaf	7,242,820.00
1922: Schools for the blind	2,893,995.00
1922: Schools for feebleminded and sub-normal	15,093,393.00
1922: Industrial schools for delinquents	18,952,835.00
1924: Amount expended	

in the various States for public elementary and secondary education	1,820,743,936.00
1924: Private elementary and secondary schools: no sums reported; but basing their expenditures on their student attendance, and using the public school per capita cost, there is the resultant of	129,463,619.00
Total	$2,438,298,242.00

These figures, up to date and unimpeachable, show a total annual expenditure by community, State and nation, **for educational purposes only**, of nearly 2½ billion dollars, with only a partial report upon higher educational and private educational institutions.

It is also of interest to know that the Federal Government itself expended last year the following items, as reported by the U. S. Bureau of Education:

To Howard University	$365,000.00
To Columbia Institute for the deaf	109,000.00
Miscellaneous. Bureau of Education	224,000.00
Alaska	550,875.00
Land grant colleges	2,550,000.00
Total	$3,798,875.00

44. "There was a time when men thought it necessary to carry pistols in self defense (and) to settle disputes."

(Note: In the original letter, the word "and" was penciled out.)

44. It we leave the "and" out, then we must point out that duellists didn't **carry** pistols for duelling. The so-called "code of honor" provided for the polite selection and choice of weapons, on the field, by the antagonists, etc. But that is beside the mark. Men **do** today carry pistols for self-protection. And they do more. In just **six** of the principal cities of the United States, the people hire thirty thousand men and **train them** to **use pistols** to protect the citizenry. And they need more.

45. "We are going to outlaw war."

45. While outlawing war between America and her possible external foes, why don't you include the outlawry of American banditry? You **will** include it? Then why not discharge these police?

46. "The reason the Conference did not take such action 25 years ago * * * is

—(1) this awful war had not been fought; (2) there was no men of vision to see the terrible havoc of war."

WAR NO NEW THING

46. Those reasons of yours, when you have re-read them, will not seem very satisfactory to you. Twenty-five years ago, and 50 years ago, and 75 years ago, and 100 years ago, our nation was just emerging from the serious consequencies of a major war. Further, no man since the dawn of history has lived so remote from war, or has been so unfamiliar with war as a social problem, that he could have any excuse for his neglect to philosophize about it.

They had vision; a nation like America is not born, and nurtured, and guided to the stature of our Republic this hour, except by men of vision. They had a wider vision than some men of today; for while they had their eyes turned toward the high goal of a Republic founded upon the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy, of Christian ethics and sound philosophy, they did not fail, as some are failing today, to realize that we "carry these treasures in earthen vessels."

A POPULAR FALLACY

47. "The men who plead for military preparedness and for war as the method to settle international disputes, are pleading for the annihilation of the white race."

47. You assume an untruth. If I knew a clearer way to state that, I should use that way. When you say that the men who plead for military preparedness, are pleading for the employment of war as a method of settling disputes, you cast a sinister reflection on every Legionnaire, every Veteran of Foreign Wars, every Disabled American Veteran. For they would work unceasingly to make use of every means other than war, to settle international disputes. And yet they plead for preparedness. Not your preparedness adovocates, nor your soldiery, have ever lead you into a war. Your citizenry have lead your soldiers into war; and because your citizenry refused to let them prepare beforehand, they were unnecessarily slaughtered in every war you have led them into.

48. "The Revolution, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and this last war, was a war between brothers of the same race and blood."

48. They were. Which means that, unfortunate though it be, it is a fact that not yet have we reached the place where

kinship is a safe protection against assault.

The chap who sand bags you for your wallet is likely to be a second cousin. Which doesn't save you head or wallet.

49. "The colored races are not fighting each other." Every such war has weakened and killed off the best of the white race and left the colored races to grow stronger."

49. (a) I shall use the same wars you cite in this connection, but it must apparently, **again** be pointed out that you constantly rest upon the false premise that preparedness advocates are **hoping** for war, and **seeking** to have war used as a means of settling things. You have no more right to say that of me today, than I have to say it of your father in the Civil War.

(b) The only war you mentioned, which strengthened a colored race, was the one which was fought to give him emancipation from bondage.

(c) The colored races of the world are fighting each other, and have always fought each other, in all cases where their real or fancied political, economical, or social domains overlapped.

(d) Furthermore, the colored races do not draw the color line when it comes to fighting. That's what gave Miles Standish his job, not to mention a number of others. That's what gave our men in the Philippines a very busy job, before we could send our school teachers and ministers in. That's why our missionaries are keeping in sight of our garrisons and gunboats in China, A. D. 1926.

50. "It is the sad spectacle of Christians fighting Christians, civilized people fighting civilized people. A sorry and idiotic state of affairs."

50. It is sorry. Unfortunately, it is a state of affairs. When we know that we, as Christian "A," is in constant danger of attack from Christian "B," there are three wise and righteous things to do. First, last and always, **to endeavor,** in every possible honorable way, to meet Christian "B" so squarely and openly that every encouragement will be given to Christian "B" to treat with us about the table, as Christians should. Second, if, having done all we know how to do, Christian "B" disregards our kindly overtures, and takes up arms against us, **to protect ourselves,** and **our ideals,** should we have ideals we deem worthy of protection. **Third,** which is also first, last and always, **to stand every minute ready to meet and to treat** with Christian "B," not as Christian "B," but simply as Christian Brother. That platform is

sound, whether our unavoidable foe be a foreign state or an American thug.

There is a corollary here. This corollary was illustrated on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. If the Samaritan had happened along two hours earlier, when the bandits were still beating that man, ought he to have passed by on the other side?

51. "The god of war is my devil. I serve the God of peace and good will."

51. If there be a deity who brings us to the necessity of the defense, by warfare, of our homes, our children, or of our principles and ideals. I, too, hold him as my devil. And I, too, humbly endeavor to serve the God of peace and goodwill. And I would follow him as he takes the scourge in His hand and physically attacks the defilers and despoilers of righteousness. And I listen to him when he says (Matthew 10:34), "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. * * * And a man's foes shall be they of his own household."

One pacifist of my acquaintance whispered the wish that Christ had not said that. I suggested that he might, if he liked, confine his Bible reading to St. Luke's report of the same pronouncement. Luke, you recall, heard Jesus mention fire among the calamities which would attend the growth of His gospel upon the earth.

BISHOP McCABE

52. "Dear old **Charley** McCabe could not be put in the same class of **sound** thinking men like **Bishop** McConnell, Harry Emerson Fosdick, S. Parkes Cadman, and a host of other thinkers."

52. This, my dear brother, is by way of being a bit shabby. I feel a bit ashamed even to enter the lists in defense of this man who, in all Methodism, needs no defense. Read these extracts from his biography, published by our church: "His preaching ability was **above** the average, as **was his scholarship. He saw truth in large, heroic form; he had the telesconic, rather than the microscopic vision.** * * * Bishop McCabe, **in the sum of his powers** (I am still quoting) and in the record of his life achievements was the **peer of any bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church.**"

I am glad you mentioned S. Parkes Cadman. Let me quote you a statement he made less than one month ago, to a friend of mine, another minister of the gospel: "War is always justifiable when it redeems a condition worse than itself."

I have touched upon most, if not all, of the points in your letter wherein we are at variance. If I have seemed severe, will you know that this matter is quite as vital to us as it is to you who are opposed to us? Throughout the generations of American history, the Christian Churches in general, and the Methodist Church in a peculiarly striking way, have flourished under the banner of the Republic, and under the protection of that banner have been enabled to, and have spread the seeds of the Gospel of Christ in the uttermost parts of the globe. Heretofore, the churches have given their support and their sons to the defense of that banner, for they have sensed the fact that in the perpetuity of this nation lay their highest hope for a world service for our Lord.

Now, some are found who would withdraw from that banner the allegiance which we demand from every foreigner who seeks nationality with us; an allegiance which is of course implied in every native citizen.

Your conference, the conference in which I was born, has already withdrawn that allegiance. It has said it will refuse to support the nation in **any** war. I am a Methodist; I am also a citizen of the United States of America. My country says she will call me to her defense in a major emergency. My church says she will refuse to sanction my answering that call. I have taken oath to support my country, and to defend her from her enemies, should such arise.

"I will pay my vow," trusting in the Lord who said to the warrior Joshua, General of his armies, "Be strong, and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

With further continuance of my brotherly love, I am, As always,

LEROY F. SMITH,
Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry Reserve.

LAG of our great republic, Guardian of our homes, inspiration in every battle for the right, Whose stars and Stripes typify to us, beauty, purity, truth, strength, courage, patriotism and the Union—We, who are citizens of this country and we, who are now receiving the honor of Citizenship.

We all Salute thee:—(hand raised) And, for thy defense, for the protection of the Constitution, of the United States for the conservation of the liberties of the American people, We pledge you our hearts our lives and our sacred honor.

Salute to the American Flag used by the Americanism Commission, Department of Illinois at naturalization Ceremonies for new citizens.

Today, many of the Churches are neglecting evangelistic work, and are experiencing the results in losses in membership and in spiritual growth.

One of the leading denominational publications, the Watchman Examiner, puts the whole subject in a nutshell in these words: "When our Churches, far and near, realize that evangelism, the saving of souls, the preaching of the pure evangel of our Lord, constitutes forever and forever the primary, vital central, incomparable and everlasting business of the Christian man and the Christian Church, there will be less talk about keywords, mottoes, chromos and slogans; and a more intense devotion to that which lies at the throbbing heart of our glorious faith. Let us, in God's name, evangelize and still evangelize, today and tomorrow and through all the days, making it the main business and the abiding purpose of our lives. When every Christian becomes an evangelist, the world will be won for Christ overnight. It is ceaseless, changeless, tireless, victorious evangelism that will work miracles and bring to pass the coming of the Kingdom."

THE CHRISTIAN HERALD,
April 23, 1927

The American's Creed

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many soveign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

—William Tyler Page.

Copies of This Pamphlet May B
Obtained From

Floyd J. Heckel, Adjutant, Depart
of Illinois, American Legion Hea
quarters, Bloomington, Illinois

AT FOLLOWING PRICES

Single Copies .....
25 Copies .....
50 Copies..... .....
100 Copies .....
500 Copies ....

Every state director of America
is urged to order enough copies of
pamphlet to supply every post wit
least one copy. It is further recon
ed that every post order a copy for
member.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

Edward James Wirtz, Printer
480
Chicago, U. S. A.